

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 are pending. Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 9, 12, and 15 are amended by the present amendment. No new matter has been added

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 6, 12, and 15 were rejected under 35 USC 101 because “An apparatus comprising: means or units (i.e., considered as software) does not include any functional structure of an apparatus (i.e., hardware structure of an apparatus).”

In response, independent Claim 1, dependent Claim 3, and independent Claim 6 have been amended to remove any possible doubt that they are means-plus-function claims. Thus, they read on “the corresponding **structure**...described in the specification and equivalents thereof.” It is, of course, elementary that a general purpose computer programmed in a particular way is treated as constituting different **structure** than a general purpose computer programmed in a different way. Hence, the claims reciting apparatuses claimed in means-plus-function format clearly “include...functional structure...”

As for independent Claim 12, dependent Claims 13 and 14, independent Claim 15, and dependent Claims 16 and 17 (i.e., the claims reciting “units” rather than means-plus-function), Applicant sees no difference between those two groups of claims insofar as the 35 USC 101 rejection is concerned. That is, they also clearly recite **structure**.

Claims 1-5, 8, and 12-14 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agraharam et al. in view of Porter et al. and further in view of Kakuta et al., and Claims 6, 7, 9-11, and 15-17 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agraharam et al., Porter et al. and Kakuta et al. in view of Erdelyi.

In response, **all** of the claims have been amended (either directly or indirectly via their dependency) to recite that the data is **received** simultaneously as well as being **transmitted**

simultaneously.

As pointed out in the previous response, Agraham describes a system in which a “conductor” at conductor session terminal 201 selects the client terminals 103 and 104 that will receive selected documents by including those terminals on a participation list PL. However, Agraham does **not** teach or suggest that the participation list is sent to any of the terminals 103 and 104—let alone that it is sent **simultaneously**. Thus, Agraham does not teach or suggest the “means for transmitting” defined in amended Claim 1.

As for Porter, it describes a document management system that **prevents** multiple users from accessing a document at the same time. Thus, Porter clearly does not include the “means for transmitting” defined in amended Claim 1.

Finally, Erdelyi describes a system for displaying video data to a **single** user—which is pretty much the antithesis of Applicant’s invention. That is, Erdelyi does not describe a list of information processing apparatuses currently accessing the shared server and belonging to the same group. Accordingly, Erdelyi does not teach or suggest either the “reception means,” the “display means,” or the “receiving means” recited in amended Claim 1.


As for Applicant’s other claims, while they are in different formats and different statutory classifications, they all share the same distinctions over the prior art relied upon in the outstanding Office Action.

Application No. 09/684,063
Reply to Office Action of October 2, 2007

An early and favorable action is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Charles L. Gholz
Registration No. 26,395